

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Minutes of UWAC
Monday December 4th, 2023
In-person Meeting

Architectural Commission

X	Renee Cheng, Chair	Dean, College of Built Environments	Voting
X	Gundula Proksch, Vice Chair	Faculty Council on Campus Planning and Stewardship	Voting
X	Cathy Simon	Professional Member	Voting
X	John Syvertsen	Professional Member	Voting
X	Andrea Leers	Professional Member	Voting
X	Linda Jewell	Professional Member	Voting
X	Edwin Harris	Professional Member	Voting
X	Valerie Lange	Student Member	Voting
X	Karisa Choi	Student Member	Voting
X	Steve Tatge	Associate Vice President of Asset Management, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Lou Cariello	Vice President, UW Facilities	Ex Officio
X	Kristine Kenney	Director of Campus Architecture & Planning, UW Facilities	Ex Officio

Minutes by Laura Salish, Executive Assistant to the Director of Campus Architecture & Planning

Call to Order

The Chair of the Architectural Commission and Dean of the College of Built Environments, Renee Cheng, called the meeting to order.

Approval of Past Minutes and Current Agenda

The September 12th, 2023 meeting minutes and current agenda were approved. Renee moved to approve, John seconded.

General Discussion

Small discussion about funding around upcoming renovations on UW campus including Bagley Hall and how we're going to need to change how we discuss things with donors because talking about pipe maintenance isn't quite as exciting as the idea of a new building.

The shift of reviewing projects that focus on deferred maintenance and renovation with less emphasis on new buildings is possibly more important because of the many constraints and issues needing to be tackled. This will require different design team expertise and possibly new commission expertise.

Discussed Rocale Timmons new role leading the West Campus Vision Planning initiative that involves several deans and senior leaders of the University engaged in discussions about future academic needs that could be realized in the development of west campus in partnership with outside entities.

Discussion of infrastructure and campus safety re: classroom access management.

Anderson Hall

Duncan Howard with Lease Crutch Lewis
Pearl Kang Hennebery Eddy Architects
Vinita Sindhu Site Workshop

Sarah Canepa Site Workshop

Historic landmark, state funded project for \$40 million

Project Goals & Overview

- The Anderson Hall Renovation will celebrate the building's historic significance while embodying the collaborative and innovative spirit of the School of Environmental and Forestry Sciences (SEFS).
- This will be achieved by maximizing program improvements.

Project Schedule Graph

Site Analysis & Concept

- Richard Haag designed the courtyard, have been challenged to find original designs. No longer building off classical geometry of the north. Completely inaccessible ADA route due to stairs at every entrance. There are accessibly graded, flat paths within the courtyard but the closer you get to the building itself, the more issues there are.
- Will establish a new main entry on the south side of the building instead of the north, with an ADA route to accessible parking and the bus stop on Steven's Way which also provides access to the rest of campus.
- Will build upon the common outdoor area shared with Bloedel and Winkenwerder. New paving in the courtyard will be thoughtful and complement the current courtyard design with materials and finishes.
- Planting concept intent is to increase campus habitat/biodiversity by providing additional landscape typologies than what currently exists.
 - Sustainable forestry cycle- mimicking what students are learning about in class
 - Meadow/pioneer species
 - Woodland/intermediate + Climax Species
 - Learning/Demonstration Garden
 - Exterior site lighting to address code requirements and safety concerns while also being Dark sky compliant

Building Renovation - General

- Landmark designated as of May 2023. Emphasis on the building exterior, groin vaults at building entry, stairs, the historic auditorium, and the Forest Room.
- The building enclosure is in relatively good condition, needs cleaning and repair, most does not need to be replaced.
- Some water damage due to failed gutters and connection at downspouts.
- Most of the recommendations are to remove the plants up against the building to provide greater air flow.

Additional Compulsory Work includes:

- Seismic reinforcement of brick and cast stone elements above building entries.
- Provide thermal performance of building enclosure by adding insulation on the interior of non landmark designated spaces and at 3rd floor ceiling.
- HVAC upgrades
- Accessibility upgrades:
 - New elevator from ground to 3rd floor
 - New entry on south elevation
 - Interior ramp to lowest level of ground floor
 - Restroom upgrades to all-gender

General Historic Features Renovation Recommendations

- Front Entry: replace florescent lighting, protect and restore the groin vaults
- Historic Staircases: replace florescent lighting and ceiling tiles, address non-compliant guardrail on stairs.

Historic Auditorium

- Replace lighting, refresh all of the finishes
- Maintain existing volume, wall locations and historic elements
- Modify instructional area to meet UW requirements
- Reinforcement of original hollow clay tile walls & exterior masonry/stone anchorage

Historic Forest Club Room Recommendations

- Maintain existing volume, wall locations and historic elements
- Replace lighting, refresh of all finishes
- Reinforcement of original hollow clay tile walls & exterior masonry/stone anchorage

Program & Space Planning

- Target Program defined through engagement with school representatives
- Proposed Program and Existing Program pie chart graphics
 - Growth in Unassignable/building support and student collaborative space
 - Decrease in administrative and faculty offices – embracing hybrid work models

Space Planning Concept

- Collaborative spaces and research centers and labs are centralized to encourage cross pollination of students, research staff and faculty.
- Instructional spaces remain in current locations.

Discussion:

- Thank you for a really wonderful presentation.
- Landscape presentation of the building, so easy to follow. When we think about projects around existing buildings, I can't think of a more logical way to go about it than what you're doing. You've handled the challenges well, so many systematic ones.
- Handling of ADA is very clever.
- Question about landscape: meadow in the front, big change from the crazy shrubs out front. Will be important to work with maintenance staff on campus to manage new plants.
- Great example of why it's important to support building renovations. Renovations are critical. So glad we were able to visit it as a part of the last Commission meeting.
- Lighting in the building is important. Support them removing that as part of the "junk" in the elevators and believes we must ensure we are finding something doesn't look too modern.
- Wonderful that we will have a main entry that is ADA accessible, that is very much needed, but should not ignore the north entry. It should be just as strong with visual connects between them once inside, Two front doors, two main entries. Many people will still enter from Stevens.
- Front entry can be activated with opportunities to sit within and experience the meadow.
- Front needs to represent the back as well re: landscaping. Not formal front and communal back. Feels like it would be hard to bring community in beyond who uses the three buildings.
- The pie chart differential is typical because building systems are more advanced and take up more space. The program is growing and shrinking in the right spaces, even if it creates less space for the building's occupants overall, it's realistic for what the building's long-term needs are.

- Student comments:
 - Outside area doesn't feel welcoming currently, it's very dark.
 - Think the forestry students might take it harshly when the trees come down but may be supportive of the planting concept.
 - Likes the meadow area, thinks it activates the space. Agree that the space as it is doesn't feel welcoming but would love to see some of the trees come down so it feels more open. Is personally nearby and walks by a lot, would enjoy coming to the expanded hangout area as it is proposed.

UH4 Design Concept Review

Shane Ruegamer, Interim PDG Director

Danielle Robins, Greystar

Paul Hanson, NAC

Ron van der Veen, NAC

Overall Project Objectives

- Increase housing options and improve the quality of housing for UW students
- Leverage up-front payment from Nordheim and Radford leases and annual rent from all four properties to pay for on campus housing projects
- Replace substandard housing at Laurel and Blakeley Villages and increase the number of housing units on these sites
- Maintain below market rents for UW students with families
- Maintain affordable rents for single students
- Increase childcare spaces for UW students, faculty and staff
- Reduce debt for Housing & Food Services
- Eliminate deferred maintenance in the Housing & Food Services Portfolio
- 501C3 Foundation will leverage Tax exempt bonds to finance project renovation and new development
- UW retains ownership of the land and improvements and 100% of net cash flow after debt service is paid.

UW Board of Regence approved the project in November 2023.

Project Overview

- One team, four sites
- Existing: Radford Court: 399-unit multifamily property built in 2003 to be repositioned as UW family housing at below market rents & childcare
- Nordheim Court: 460-bed students housing property building 2003 primed for value-add improvements to residential units and common areas
- New development:
 - Laurel V: 351 units of family housing and childcare
 - Blakeley V: 1013 new undergraduate beds

Major Project Milestones Schedule (graphic)

- Currently in due diligence
- Early 2024 will be design, plan to come back to UWAC in 2024
- Campus Plan & Local Knowledge (Graphic)

Blakely Design Goal: An energetic undergraduate living experience, set within a natural urban setting

An Urban Setting

- Historic Conditions
- Site is adjacent to the historic outflow of Greenlake
- Long vacant, mall-adjacent
- Trail connection
- Secret tree fort upon impenetrable wall/parking garage
- Existing trees on site, doing our best to retain
- Steep hill on one side
- Limited vehicular access

Blakeley Setting

- Physical Conditions
- Active at night
- Premiere shopping
- Programmatic Conditions

Affordable

- Maximize Allowable Area 460,000sf
- Upper-division housing. A degree of autonomy while designing community.

Blakely inspiration

- Lush trail
- Urban energy
- Quiet Forest

Divide and center (diagrams)

- Split the bars—walking, access and engagement spaces
- Breaks in the façade allows us to create moments that create more space engagement and opens up the center. Pushing and pulling along the length.

Additional graphics of how various floors might be structured and how they might interact with the outside space they are near.

Discussion:

- What do you imagine would be the spaces that will support community other than the central linear outdoor space? What about the linear space creates a community?
 - Program and density
 - Maybe a health and wellness space, potentially classrooms, gaming space (each building would have its own characteristic)
- These places where you can come together, including outdoor spaces, become important places to gather. Top right building doesn't have as much outdoor space as the others, would encourage one for this community to share. Need to make sure there is direct access to the outdoor spaces at each building.
 - -Hope is that they are encouraged to use the other spaces and work together
- Site analysis and larger intentions are sound. Clear the buildings will be connected to the linear pathway and Nordheim court.

- Where real community will develop is along this linear path and at the endpoint. Develop this in a very programmatic way as an area where people will gather, pause, sit down. In a community like this, it probably won't be in the interior spaces.
- Views of the building exteriors seem very harsh and highly repetitive. Give some attention to giving them a residential character - right now they could be offices. Give them some of the variation you also see in plan.
- If this an affordable housing project that the University offers, how is it defined and how will it be guaranteed in the future? Is the University involved in defining the affordability?
 - Want to make sure project is differentiated from other construction in the area. Greystar only receives a fee at the successful completion of the project.
 - Nonprofit will take over
 - University will serve on the Nonprofit committee to set the annual budget-35 year partnership
- There's a logical breakdown of the building - two long bars that are too long, break them and augment them with articulation... just not bought in yet to the quality of thinking of the site design.
- The concept of the BGT does not appear to be an important driver in the concept.
- What is the real nature of the experience of this site from BGT?
- Do you access this site from 30th and 49th and if so, what is this experience like?
- The central break between all buildings focuses on the corner of the garage - a view we haven't seen - needs to be looked into.
- In general, there doesn't seem to be a front door.
 - Connection is also key for how students get to the site how they have access to things as low-income students who are less likely to have access to vehicles.
- Also potential concern about the access from the Burke Gilman Trail
 - -Is a very porous site in some ways
- Still concerned about scale, needs to be mediated. Agree with the circular gathering space. Pull that Burke Gilman Trail massing down further and it could be even more accessible.
- Considering multiple forms of circulation.
- Breaking of the southern bar doesn't have to be complete. Could be a continuous building but have some separation and programmatic access. Potentially including access to the Burke Gilman.
- Student Feedback: Would like to see a light study, concerned about location of parks, seems like they should be flipped to active the central outdoor space.
- Agreed, seems like the engaging space would include more outdoor hangout space rather than the secluded park space with high buildings and trees around it, too private.
- Desire to have a clearly defined point of arrival.

Laurel Village Redevelopment

- Natural Setting
- A place of living along the shores.
- Logging, the exhibition, The lowering of the lake, veteran housing.

Diagrams of physical conditions throughout time

Physical conditions now: Existing trees, significant slope, poor soils

Laurel V setting & land use conditions

- Zoning change + height limits
- Programmatic conditions
- Maximum allowable area: 386,000sq ft
- Graduate and family housing about 350 units in a wide mix of types from tidos to 3 bedrooms

- Includes 160 replacement family housing units, long the historical use
- Affordability requirement (50%)
- Childcare + Play area, 120 students
- Parking requirement for family housing
- Trail adjacent to BGT

Laurel Concept Community Center

- Wash off the day and settle into the community
- Anchor the site with a community amenity
- Solar access

Laurel studies

- Graphic
- Density Study
- Meets density requirements, meets affordability and family housing requirements
- Create a community center
- Provide child care
- Meeting the topography
- Connection through site to campus and trail
- Height limits
- Parking for families
- Retain existing trees

Discussion:

- Did you think about putting parking along 45th given the noise?
- Need for childcare is so important for campus, is there a possibility to increase the daycare beyond the 120 as a second phase?
- This is a far more complex site as you pointed out... you've taken a perimeter approach with a wall to the south. Why not consider a 'C' shape building?
- Did you look at a series of buildings stepped down the slope, perpendicular to the street?
- Lining the residential side of the site with parking doesn't seem like a good neighbor. Pockets of parking would be better.
- Interested in seeing some very different massing options.
- Reflect on the use of the site and the adjacent development across the street. Corner of NE 45th Pl and NE 45th St has been finished now but it greatly reduced the amount of trees in the area. Taking out a lot of the trees in the proposed Laurel Village setting might be non-beneficial for the neighborhood. Something to keep in mind.
- Appreciate having the open space in the interior of the site is ok if it's for families to keep children safe and more private.
- Is there any way to think about preserving the area shown as parking as a future development opportunity as our transportation requirements change?
- Think about daycare as a 2-story volume with elevator access.
- Is there any concern with having childcare adjacent to the Laurelhurst community?
- Suggest you look at some of the massing and layout options used at UWB housing/dining

Haggett Hall

Share Ruegamer - PDG

Craig Holt - Anderson Construction
Anne Schopf – Mahlum
Maitland Jones – TenBurke
Kara Weaver - GGN

Very happy with their project progress and excited to share.

Project Overview:

- Schedule, on schedule every step of the way
- 25% design was delivered on 11/15/23
- 25% design pricing due 12/20/23
- Abatement began 11/2/23
- Podium demolition starts 12/18/23

Value Proposition and Design Strategies

- A residence hall that supports a student community
- Facilities that support campus fitness and wellness
- Site design, landscape design and sustainable construction nurture an ethos of well being

Overview: Site Circulation diagram

Overview: Massing

- West Wing, Living on the Quad

Overview: East-Wing Section through Courtyard

- Diagram showing difference and similarities between east and west buildings

Overview: Residential Communities

- Levels 1-3: 1RA to 65 beds each
- Residential Communities:
- Levels 4-5 1RA to 50 beds
- Level 6: 1RA to 65 beds
- Level 7: 1RA to 35 beds

Reviewed diagrams and color coded space allocations

Residential Amenities: Terrace level 175'

- Residential Life Offices
- Lounges
- Open kitchens
- Meeting rooms
- Laundry rooms
- Vending
- Gaming
- Allergy Kitchen
- Terrace level 175' Reflection/awe space can go straight down stair or go into wellness area
- Next floor down: yoga/dance room, cardio gym space, outdoor terrace, stairs that come out from building
- Next floor down (ground): elevator vestibule, core/strength training, multipurpose room

Health, Fitness and Wellness site context

- How is wellness accessible
- Site sitting, courtyard: Landscape identity, ecological health and wellness
 - Design evolution site plan
 - Moved the portal to be more integrated
 - Stair now lands on the landing to create a more equal experience
 - Setting up bioretention
 - Section diagram of site, sitting, courtyard
 - Courtyard perspective diagram, feeling seen without feeling like you're in a fishbowl
 - Circulation diagram
 - Moments of human experience color coded diagram indicating gathering spaces, opportunities for lingering and edges
 - Vehicular access, were able to work through those issues to allow maintenance and management through

Building character:

- We think of it as doing much with little. All brick. Ribbed texture in some areas, view north from Mason Road. Other than that the wings are very similar.
- Visible in the context of its neighbors.
- Putting together an exterior package in coming months, do not have cost estimate yet.
- Balance between smaller more discreet moves like Willow and large, bold moves like McMahon.

Discussion:

- Why the differential in height the way that it is?
 - Floor level is at 155, lifted up. Because of accessible route on that corner
 - Landings are doing more than one thing, walking space and easy for a 5 minute phone conversation.
- Perch and porch woven together is great stitching, smart way to go. Ground floor features are where the excitement happens. Doing a lot of work, want to see more enrichment. Wants to see the texture. Very nice presentation.
- Seconding great presentation. Excited to go there. Different ways of looking at the courtyard and Mt. Tahoma/Mt. Rainier. Beautiful development from last meeting together.
- Very happy with the presentation. We were told when this was started, this is one of the most difficult areas of campus to work on and very happy where you have gotten to.
- Blown away by the handling of this devilish site - horizontally and vertically with spaces tucked in everywhere.
- Raising the upper building above a two-story base is a generous way to make this site porous. Desire to retain the articulation along this base is more important than articulating the top portion of the building. Don't lose the sense of the building floating above.
- Notion of the "wild" place below is beautiful and amazing. Private to the group but also a real magnet for others on the campus.
- Find a way to keep the stair all at one level.
- This is a fantastic example of a well-integrated team and is very noticeable in the way you talk about the project and advocate for the same things. If there are images or notes of how you're working so other teams can learn from this.
- Student Feedback: Feels safer than the previous design, like the landing on the stair as it overlooks the courtyard, would like to make the space feel more open to different types of students. Meditation/reflection/awe space may not be utilized enough by a typical student. Is there a way to

draw in other students that may not be inclined to using this space - "the gym bros that go to the lower level"

- Vehicle access on right. Are there more points of access on the lower side of the building?
 - Has been a lot of discussion about this, creating a walkway from Mason, parallel to Whatcom
- Courtyard, could the trellis structure be covered so that it could be enjoyed year round since Seattle is wet so much of the year?
 - It is a thought but we don't want it to be too enclosed. We do have several areas that are covered to prevent rain.
- Why don't stairs line up across the courtyard?
 - Vehicle access and reconcile the obvious experience with wanting people to engage with the rest of the space, cheaper to build and uses less space. Longer explanation could take many weeks. Also not the same grade.

UWAC Discussion

UH4

Concerned with the way the team recapped the commission's comments. Not sure they comprehended the disappointment with the development of both designs. UW will need to alert Pam and Rod about these concerns and reach out to the Greystar team to ensure they understand the significance of the design for these sites.

Anderson Hall

Two entrances would be ideal. Would have loved to have seen a section of the building. Did a great job explaining a complicated remodel. This should be a model case for renovations going forward. Encouraged that they found the façade in good shape.

Welcome Center

University is going to enter into an LLC with the Book Store to develop a building on the parking lot across from the Burke Museum on 15th Ave to include the UW Welcome Center. Seen as a gateway into the local and wider community. LLC put out an RFP, down to 2 respondents and LLC has landed on an unannounced choice. Market rate student housing will also be incorporated (UW not involved in that portion of the development).

Laura to:

Reset ability for people to change names in Zoom meetings
Change ability for people to be able to chat with everyone in Zoom meetings
Post presentations by the end of the week on UWAC website

Potential upcoming presentations:

- Chemical Sciences Building & Bagley Hall Renovation
- ASUW Shellhouse Renovation (tour in May?)
- Intellectual House

Meeting Adjourned at 2:15PM.

The next meeting will be held online on Monday, February 5th, 2023.